REMARKS

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed August 31, 2009 ("Action"). Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested based on the below remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pattabiraman et al. (US 2003/0195010) in view of Kakihara et al. (US 2003/0156097).

Claims 5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pattabiraman and Kakihara, in further view of Lin (US 2002/0102998).

Claims 6, 7, 13, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pattabiraman and Kakihara, in further view of Zad Issa et al. (US 6,751,313).

Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

A. Comments on Claim 1

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pattabiraman and Kakihara.

Pattabiraman discloses techniques for emulating a wireless communication device on a wide area network. Paragraph [0052] of Pattabiraman discloses a method, in relation to Fig 4, in which a device B is used to emulate a device A. In this method, device B receives authentication information from an identity module of device A over a local wireless link. Data and voice communication then flow "between device A and [a] wide area network, using the link between device B and the wide area network and the local link between device A and device B" (see paragraph [0052]).

Kakihara discloses a portable terminal/cellular phone connected to an in-vehicle device such as a vehicle navigation system. The abstract of Kakihara states "[a]fter detecting the connection between the portable terminal and the in-vehicle device, a control unit of the cellular phone supplies display data to be displayed on its screen to the in-vehicle device. A control unit of the in-vehicle device displays on the screen the display data supplied from the portable terminal." Paragraphs [0013] and [0038] of Kakihara state that the screen of the cellular phone 12 may be set to a non-display mode when the portable terminal is connected to the in-vehicle device. This is because, when such a connection is established, it is preferred to display data on

the display of the in-vehicle device rather than the display of the cellular phone 12.

The Action asserts that Pattabiraman discloses "accessory interface circuitry adapted to transfer a message to [a] mobile telecommunications terminal via [a] connector, said message comprising a specification of at least a part of the media processing functionality provided by… media processing circuitry included in the apparatus." The Action also asserts that this corresponds to a situation where device A transfers voice or data to device B so that device B can send it to the wide area network.

In the attached claim set, claim 1 has been amended to refer to an apparatus comprising "accessory interface circuitry configured to provide a message for transfer to a mobile telecommunications terminal, said message comprising a specification identifying… at least a first data processing algorithm performable by… media data processing circuitry included in the apparatus." This feature is not disclosed by Pattabiraman, because it is clear that device A does not transfer anything to device B that could be considered to be "a specification identifying at least a first data processing algorithm performable by media data processing circuitry" included in device A.

The Action further asserts that Kakihara discloses an apparatus "adapted to transfer a message to [a] mobile communications terminal to disable… specified processing functionality in a second media processing circuitry, the second media processing circuitry [being] located in the mobile telecommunications terminal, and wherein the apparatus is configured to receive media data forwarded from the mobile telecommunications terminal for processing by the media processing circuitry of the apparatus due to the disabling of the second media processing circuitry of the mobile telecommunications terminal."

In making this argument, the Action appears to consider the "mobile telecommunications terminal" referred to in claim 1 to correspond with the portable terminal/cellular phone 12 referred to in Kakihara. The Action also appears to consider the "second media processing circuitry located in the mobile telecommunications terminal" referred to in claim 1 to correspond with the display of the portable terminal and the "media processing circuitry of the apparatus" to correspond with the display device of the in-vehicle device in Kakihara.

Attached claim 1 has been amended to refer to an apparatus that comprises "media data processing circuitry configured to perform at least a first data processing algorithm on media data in the apparatus." It is noted that this "media data processing circuitry" cannot be considered to correspond with the display of the in-vehicle device in Kakihara, because the in-

vehicle device of Kakihara is not configured to "perform at least a first data processing algorithm on media data."

Claim 1 in the present application has also been amended to recite that "the media data processing circuitry is configured, following disablement of further media data processing circuitry configured to perform at least a second data processing algorithm on media data in the mobile telecommunications terminal, to perform the at least a first data processing algorithm on first media data in place of the performance of the at least a second data processing algorithm on the first media data in the mobile telecommunications terminal."

It is noted that the display of the portable terminal in Kakihara cannot be considered to correspond with the "further media data processing circuitry" in attached claim 1, because the display of the portable terminal in Kakihara is not "configured to perform at least a second data processing algorithm on media data."

In embodiments of the invention, an apparatus (such as an accessory device) provides a message for transfer to a mobile telecommunications terminal. The message comprises a specification identifying at least a first data processing algorithm that is performable by media processing circuitry included in the apparatus. The mobile telecommunications terminal may determine, from the specification, that the apparatus is able to perform a particular processing task. The mobile telecommunications terminal may, for example, subsequently delegate the performance of that processing task to the apparatus (see attached claim 17, for example). As a consequence, further media data processing circuitry of the mobile telecommunications terminal may be disabled.

Following disablement of the further media data processing circuitry in the mobile telecommunications terminal, the media data processing circuitry of the apparatus may perform the at least a first data processing algorithm on first media data, in place of the performance of at least a second data processing algorithm (by the further media data processing circuitry) on the first media data in the mobile telecommunications terminal. For example, the apparatus may perform an echo-cancelling algorithm or a frequency equalising algorithm (see claims 6 and 7) instead of the mobile telecommunications terminal.

Therefore, in embodiments of the invention, an apparatus may provide a specification to a mobile telecommunications terminal indicating that it can provide particular processing functionality, and the responsibility for the performance of that processing functionality can be moved from the mobile telecommunications terminal to the apparatus.

Neither Pattabiraman nor Kakihara disclose the transfer of such a specification to a mobile telecommunications terminal, nor do they disclose the subsequent transfer in responsibility for the performance of processing functionality from the mobile telecommunications terminal to the apparatus. Consequently, no combination of Pattabiraman and Kakihara can result in anything falling within the scope of independent claim 1. In view of this, independent claim 1 is considered to be allowable.

Independent claims 8 and 21 are considered to be allowable for similar reasons.

The claims that respectively depend on claims 1, 8, and 21 are allowable at least due to their dependency on an allowable claim, in addition to the features they recite.

CONCLUSION

For all of the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the currently presented claims are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue forthwith. Accordingly, such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should it be deemed necessary to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: November 30, 2009

By:/Christopher M. Swickhamer/
Christopher M. Swickhamer
Registration No. 59,853
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive,
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001